

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

James Hubert Wright, Jr.,

Plaintiff,

v.

Aiken County Sheriff's Department; Aiken
County Detention Center; Georgia Carolina
Enterprises Inc.,

Defendant.

C/A No. 1:24-cv-7167-JFA-PJG

ORDER

Plaintiff James Hubert Wright, Jr., proceeding pro se, filed this complaint pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2) (D.S.C.), the case was referred to the Magistrate Judge for initial review.

After performing an initial review of the complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 1915, the Magistrate Judge issued an order directing Plaintiff to file the documents necessary to bring this case into proper form for the issuance and service of process. (ECF No. 10). The order warned Plaintiff that his failure to comply with the order within the time permitted would subject his case to dismissal for failure to prosecute and for failure to comply with an order of the court under Rule 41 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Plaintiff did not respond to that order.

Thereafter, the Magistrate Judge prepared a thorough Report and Recommendation¹ ("Report"). (ECF No. 17). Within the Report, the Magistrate Judge opines the Complaint

¹ The Magistrate Judge's review is made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(d) (D.S.C.). The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this

is subject to dismissal for failure to comply with a court order and failure to prosecute pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41. *Id.* The Report sets forth, in detail, the relevant facts and standards of law on this matter, and this Court incorporates those facts and standards without a recitation.

Plaintiff was advised of his right to object to the Report, which was entered on the docket on February 20, 2025. *Id.* The Magistrate Judge required Plaintiff to file objections by March 5, 2025. *Id.* Plaintiff failed to file objections. Thus, this matter is ripe for review.

A district court is only required to conduct a *de novo* review of the specific portions of the Magistrate Judge's Report to which an objection is made. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); *Carniewski v. W. Virginia Bd. of Prob. & Parole*, 974 F.2d 1330 (4th Cir. 1992). In the absence of specific objections to portions of the Magistrate's Report, this Court is not required to give an explanation for adopting the recommendation. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

Here, Plaintiff has failed to raise any objections and therefore this Court is not required to give an explanation for adopting the recommendation. A review of the Report and prior orders indicates that the Magistrate Judge correctly concluded that Plaintiff's Complaint is subject to dismissal pursuant to Rule 41.

After carefully reviewing the applicable laws, the record in this case, and the Report, this Court finds the Magistrate Judge's recommendation fairly and accurately summarizes the facts and applies the correct principles of law. Accordingly, this Court adopts the


Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976).

Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation and incorporates it herein by reference.

(ECF No. 17). Consequently, this action is summarily dismissed without prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

April 2, 2025
Columbia, South Carolina

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Joseph F. Anderson, Jr." in a cursive script.

Joseph F. Anderson, Jr.
United States District Judge